

March 18, 1975

to its natural conclusion. I would agree with those who would say that Mr. Sullivan should go to the Budget Committee and get his appropriation for a program, in the same manner that anybody else would. Certainly, if we are going to approach it somebody should advise us as to what the need for this is to cover the costs of operating the courts, and what would be left over, if there is a surplus. Then, perhaps, the alternative is to reduce this increase by a dollar, or whatever, and simply have it address itself to the court cost; or else find out, if you're going to adopt the DeCamp amendment, what the deficit and court costs will be. The simple fact is that I don't think you can fund two purposes with the same money. That's what they're trying to do here. It appears to me that's what they're trying to do here. I don't think Senator DeCamp addressed that. He probably should on his close. I don't know about bracketing. Maybe that's appropriate until we get these kind of answers.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm totally opposed to bracketing the bill. First of all, the essence of this bill is an increase in the amount of costs an individual will have assessed against him or her in certain legal actions. I think the amendment is entirely irrelevant to the essence of the bill. It has nothing to do with the validity of raising, or not raising, court costs. I think that amendment can be disposed of at this time. The bill itself, even though I'm opposed to it, need not be held up for an extraneous matter like this. I'm not going to repeat all of the alternatives that have been suggested already for funding the program that Mr. Sullivan has in mind. I'm totally opposed to the bracketing of the bill. I will vote not to bracket. I will also vote against the amendment. Then, when that amendment is disposed of, I'm going to move to kill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. President, members of the body, I have a question of Senator Luedtke, and also of Senator Marvel if they would yield. Senator Luedtke, the \$2 increase, which you're requesting in this proposed legislation, is that absolutely necessary for the courts, in terms of their expenditures in the future?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: That is correct. That is why the court administrator, exercising the office which we set up . . . which the court has set up and which we advised to be set up, advised us that this is what we need to run an efficient court system on more or less a pay-as-you-go plan, as much as we can through court costs. This was the theory of the whole court plan. This is why we shouldn't get it mixed up, as Senator Chambers so well put it, with all of these other costs that you could put on court costs. It ridiculous to start loading up with everything that deals with courts and criminal justice. You just can't do it.